# REVIEW FOR APPLICABILITY OF/COMPLIANCE WITH ORDINANCES/POLICIES

## FOR PURPOSES OF CONSIDERATION OF TM 5316RPL<sup>2</sup>, Log No. 03-14-031

June 8, 2006

| I. HABITAT LOSS PERMIT ORDINANCE – Does the proposed project conform to the Habitat Loss Permit/Coastal Sage Scrub Ordinance findings?  |                |               |   |  |  |  |  |
|---|----------------|---------------|---|--|--|--|--|
|   | YES            | NO            | NOT APPLICABLE/EXEMPT   |  |  |  |  |
| Discussion:   |                |               |   |  |  |  |  |
| of the Multiple S   | Species Cons   | ervation Prog | provements are located within the boundaries gram. Therefore, conformance to the Habitat ce findings is not required. |  |  |  |  |
| II. MSCP/BMO - Does the proposed project conform to the Multiple Species Conservation Program and Biological Mitigation Ordinance?  |                |               |   |  |  |  |  |
|   | YES            | NO            | NOT APPLICABLE/EXEMPT   |  |  |  |  |
| Discussion:   |                |               |   |  |  |  |  |
| The proposed project and any off-site improvements related to the proposed project conforms with the requirements of the Multiple Species Conservation Program and Biological Mitigation Ordinance (BMO). |                |               |   |  |  |  |  |
| III. GROUNDWATER ORDINANCE - Does the project comply with the requirements of the San Diego County Groundwater Ordinance?   |                |               |   |  |  |  |  |
|   | YES            | NO            | NOT APPLICABLE/EXEMPT  ☑  |  |  |  |  |
| Discussion:   |                |               |   |  |  |  |  |
| The project will  | obtain its wat | er supply fro | m the Helix Water District which obtains water  |  |  |  |  |

from surface reservoirs and/or imported sources. The project will not use any

groundwater for any purpose, including irrigation or domestic supply.

## **IV. RESOURCE PROTECTION ORDINANCE** - Does the project comply with:

| The wetland and wetland buffer regulations (Article IV, Sections 1 & 2) of the Resource Protection Ordinance?        | YES | NO | NOT APPLICABLE/EXEMPT |
|--|-----|----|-----------------------|
| The Floodways and Floodplain Fringe section (Article IV, Section 3) of the Resource Protection Ordinance?            | YES | NO | NOT APPLICABLE/EXEMPT |
| The Steep Slope section (Article IV, Section 5)?   | YES | NO | NOT APPLICABLE/EXEMPT |
| The Sensitive Habitat Lands section (Article IV, Section 6) of the Resource Protection Ordinance?                    | YES | NO | NOT APPLICABLE/EXEMPT |
| The Significant Prehistoric and Historic Sites section (Article IV, Section 7) of the Resource Protection Ordinance? | YES | NO | NOT APPLICABLE/EXEMPT |

### Discussion:

#### Wetland and Wetland Buffers:

The site contains no wetland habitats as defined by the San Diego County Resource Protection Ordinance. The site does not have a substratum of predominately undrained hydric soils, the land does not support, even periodically, hydric plants, nor does the site have a substratum that is non-soil and is saturated with water or covered by water at some time during the growing season of each year.

## Floodways and Floodplain Fringe:

The project is not located in a floodway or floodplain as defined in the Resource Protection Ordinance.

### Steep Slopes:

The average slope for the property is 11.3 percent gradient. Slopes with a gradient of 25 percent or greater and 50 feet or higher in vertical height are required to be placed in open space easements by the San Diego County Resource Protection Ordinance (RPO). There are no steep slopes on the property. The project is in conformance with the RPO.

#### Sensitive Habitats:

Coastal sage scrub habitat has been identified on-site. This is a County of San Diego sensitive habitat. However, the coastal sage scrub is considered low quality/disturbed because it is scattered in small patches totaling 0.11 acres and has been indirectly impacted by surrounding development. Therefore, it has been found that the proposed project complies with Article IV, Item 6 of the Resource Protection Ordinance.

## Significant Prehistoric and Historic Sites:

The County of San Diego staff has inspected the property, analyzed records, and determined there are no archaeological/ historical sites.

|             | shed Protec |    | - Does the project com<br>ater Management and    | nply with the County of<br>Discharge Control |
|-------------|-------------|----|--|--|
|             | YES         | NO | NOT APPLICABI                                    | _E   |
| Discussion: |             |    |  |  |
| •           |             |    | pted the Stormwater M<br>Engineering & Survey    | /lanagement Plan dated<br>/ing.              |
|             |             |    | ect comply with the Cou<br>e County of San Diego |  |
|             | YES         | NO | NOT APPLICABI                                    | _E   |

#### Discussion:

The proposal would not expose people to nor generate potentially significant noise levels which exceed the allowable limits of the County of San Diego Noise Element of the General Plan, County of San Diego Noise Ordinance, and other applicable local, State, and Federal noise control regulations.

Transportation (traffic, railroad, aircraft) noise levels at the project site are not expected to exceed Community Noise Equivalent Level (CNEL)=60 decibels (dB) limit because review of the project indicates that the project is not in close proximity to a railroad and/or airport. Additionally, the County of San Diego GIS noise model does not indicate that the project would be subject to potential excessive noise levels from circulation element roads either now or at General Plan buildout.

Noise impacts to the proposed project from adjacent land uses are not expected to exceed the property line sound level limits of the County of San Diego Noise Ordinance.